

BOB ZIEGELBAUER

STATE REPRESENTATIVE • TWENTY FIFTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

**Committee on Urban & Local Affairs
Representative Edward Brooks, Chair
Tuesday, April 26, 2011, 300 Northeast
Support for Assembly Bill 14**

Chairman Brooks and Committee Members:

Thank you for holding a public hearing on Assembly Bill 14, relating to the repeal of the "Maintenance of Effort for Police and Fire Protection Services" law, which was included in the 2009-2011 State Budget (2009 Act 28). This law prevents local governments from reducing its largest budget components, the police and fire departments, below their 2009 spending levels, punishable by loss of State shared revenues. (See attached excerpt from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau's "Comparative Summary of Budget Recommendations, 2009 Act 28").

During a time when we are actively working to give local government the tools necessary to manage better, counties and municipalities need all the flexibility we can give them as they face significant revenue cuts. The last thing State government should do is impose an arbitrary minimum spending mandate that ties the hands of officials looking to make the difficult decisions to balance their budgets. They are a far better judge of their priorities than we can ever be.

This new and unnecessary mandate did not solve any problems or answer any complaints. As important as the police and fire departments are in protecting public safety, the current "Maintenance of Effort" law is a clear example of an unnecessary, unfunded mandate that ought to be repealed. The State Legislature should provide local governments with more flexibility, not less, in how they deliver public services to their communities.

Thank you again for your consideration. I am happy to answer your questions at this time.

###

STATE CAPITOL: P.O. BOX 8953, MADISON, WI 53708-8953 • (608) 266-0315 • TOLL FREE: 1-888-529-0025

FAX: (608) 282-3625 • HOME PAGE: www.bobziegelbauer.com • E-MAIL: rep.ziegelbauer@legis.wisconsin.gov

DISTRICT: 1213 S. 8TH STREET, P.O. BOX 325, MANITOWOC, WI 54221-0325

MANITOWOC COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE: (920) 683-5107 • HOME: (920) 684-6783

Direct Aid Payments

1. COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL AID PAYMENT REDUCTIONS [LFB Paper 700]

	Governor (Chg. to Base)	Jt. Finance/Leg. (Chg. to Gov)	Net Change
GPR	-\$8,547,000	-\$21,367,600	-\$29,914,600

Governor: Reduce funding by \$8,547,000 in 2010-11 for making 2010 payments under the county and municipal aid program, a reduction equal to 1% of the county and municipal aid account. Allocate the total reduction separately among municipalities and counties in proportion to current distributions for municipalities and counties from the county and municipal aid account. Specify that initial reductions to individual municipalities and counties would be made based on their share of the total statewide equalized value. Modify these initial reductions so that no municipality or county has a total reduction exceeding 15% of their current law 2010 payment. Fund these 15% maximum cut modifications by further reducing payments to the remaining municipalities and counties on a per capita basis, also subject to the 15% maximum total reduction. These calculations would be done separately for municipalities and for counties. Specify that for payments in 2011 and thereafter, payments for each municipality and county would equal their 2010 payment.

Joint Finance/Legislature: Reduce funding by an additional \$21,367,600 in 2010-11 for making 2010 payments, to provide a total reduction for the program (when added to the reduction in the bill) of \$29,914,600. Modify the bill to specify that the total reduction for all counties and the total reduction for all municipalities shall be calculated separately by multiplying the total payment to each group from the county and municipal aid account by 3.5%, instead of 1.0%. Maintain the same mechanism for reducing payments to individual counties and municipalities as the bill, except to specify that the calculation of the 15% maximum payment reduction would be calculated using each local government's total prior year payment, instead of the portion of the payment made from the county and municipal aid account. Specify that, beginning with the distributions in 2011 (paid in fiscal year 2011-12), the total amount to be distributed annually under the program from the county and municipal aid account would be \$824,825,715. This amount reflects the funding reductions under this item, plus an adjustment to the payment for the City of Stanley, summarized separately below.

[Act 28 Sections: 1894, 1895, and 1898 thru 1900]

2. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT FOR POLICE AND FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

Joint Finance: Specify that, beginning in 2010, the amount that each county and municipality spends each year for emergency services shall be no less than the amount that the

county or municipality spent in 2009 for emergency services, not including one-time expenses. Require each county and municipality to report, to the Department of Revenue, at a time and in the manner prescribed by the Department, the amount of its expenditures for emergency services in 2009 and the amount of its one-time expenses for emergency services. Require DOR, for the purposes of this provision, to develop a definition of "emergency services" and specify that the Department may adjust any amount reported by a local government to more accurately reflect the amount spent for emergency services. Specify that a county or municipality may decrease the amount it spends for emergency services below the 2009 amount, with DOR's approval, if the decrease is a result of operating efficiencies, as determined by DOR, and specify that any such decrease shall be the new minimum expenditure level for future years' emergency services expenditures. Specify that if a county or municipality fails to comply with these requirements, DOR may reduce the county or municipality's payment under the county and municipal aid program, in an amount determined by the Department.

Senate/Legislature: Modify provision by adding capital expenditures to one-time expenses as items that may be excluded from the maintenance of effort requirement. Specify that DOR may adjust the reported amounts to ensure that excluding any one-time expenses or capital expenditures does not compromise the level of service for providing emergency services. In addition, specify that the definition of emergency services under this provision includes only those emergency services expenditures that are funded with payments under the county and municipal aid program.

[Act 28 Section: 1900k]

3. SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENT TO THE CITY OF STANLEY

GPR	\$37,200
-----	----------

Joint Finance/Legislature: Require the Department of Revenue to increase the payment that the City of Stanley would otherwise receive in 2010 under the county and municipal aid program by \$37,200. Increase funding for the county and municipal aid program by \$37,200 in 2010-11 to reflect this requirement. Adjust the total distribution under the program in 2011 and thereafter to reflect this supplemental payment. The increase under this item was calculated based on the current population of the Stanley Correctional Institution times a per capita rate of \$25.15, subject to a 3.5% reduction (the overall reduction percentage for the county and municipal aid program). The per capita rate of \$25.15 is the rate that would be paid currently (based on 2008 population estimates) if the per capita component of the shared revenue formula were still operative. The shared revenue per capita payment formula, as well as other components of the formula, was suspended in 2002, prior to the opening of the Stanley Correctional Institution.

[Act 28 Sections: 1893 and 9143(3c)]

PART III

RECOMMENDATIONS INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

This part of the report provides background information on, and a description of, the drafts as recommended by the Special Committee on Local Service Consolidation.

LRB-1430/1, Relating to County and Municipal Expenditures for Emergency Services

Background

Current law requires that, beginning in 2010, the amount that each county or municipality spends annually for emergency services that are funded by county or municipal aid payments (shared revenue) be no less than the amount that the county or municipality spent in 2009 for emergency services, not including capital expenditures and one-time expenses. If a county or municipality does not comply with this requirement, DOR may reduce payments to the county or municipality under the shared revenue program. With the approval of DOR, a county or municipality may decrease the amount it spends for emergency services below its 2009 amount if the decrease is a result of operating more efficiently.

The committee heard testimony about, and discussed, the law relating to the maintenance of effort for emergency services and its effect on local service consolidation and cooperation. The committee recommended repealing the law related to maintenance of effort for emergency services in order to remove any impediment to consolidation and cooperation created by the law.

Description

LRB-1430/1 repeals the law related to maintenance of effort for emergency services.

WLC: 0002/1, Relating to Different Property Tax Levy Rates for Parts of Cities, Villages, Towns, Counties, and School Districts Added by Attachments to School Districts, Consolidations, and Boundary Changes Under Cooperative Agreements (First Consideration)

Background

Wisconsin Constitution, Article VIII, Section 1, provides that the "rule of taxation shall be uniform," subject to specified exceptions.

The committee heard testimony about the Uniformity Clause and its effect on local service consolidation and cooperation. Specifically, the committee discussed the inability of municipalities to have different tax rates upon consolidation, as a result of the Uniformity Clause, as a predominant challenge to consolidation efforts of municipalities. The committee discussed the specific instances where the Uniformity Clause was a barrier. It recommended modifications to the Uniformity Clause in order to remove any impediment to consolidation and cooperation created by the Wisconsin Constitution.



WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
PROPOSED REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
LOCAL SERVICE
CONSOLIDATION

February 18, 2011

PRL 2011-04



Date: April 22, 2011

To: Assembly Committee on Urban and Local Affairs
Edward Brooks, Chairman

From: Michael Konecny, CPA
Schenck SC

RE: Public Hearing on AB 14
April 26, 10:00 AM

This is testimony in favor of AB 14, the Act to repeal 79.07 of the statutes; relating to county and municipal expenditures for emergency services.

Background and Experience

My name is Michael Konecny and I reside at 3100 Pioneer Dr., Green Bay, Wisconsin. I am employed as a Certified Public Accountant with the CPA firm of Schenck SC. Schenck SC is a Wisconsin based CPA firm with 9 offices in eastern and central Wisconsin. I am currently the shareholder in charge of all audit and consulting services rendered to local units of government in Wisconsin. Our government client list includes over 350 Wisconsin Counties, Cities, Villages and Towns. I, personally, have been involved in providing accounting and auditing services to local governments in Wisconsin for over 35 years.

Annually, I provide consulting services to many local units of government in regard to achieving efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery through cutting costs, increasing productivity of employees and reducing overhead. Obviously, implementation of any department changes affects the local government's annual budget. Our primary goal has always been to help the local government more effectively provide services to the community, at the appropriate level desired by the constituents, in the most economical manner.

Reasons for Repealing 79.07

I believe Section 79.07 should be repealed for the following reasons:

- In my opinion, Section 79.07 hinders Wisconsin local units of government in achieving efficiencies and effectiveness in the delivery of Emergency Services. In today's environment, local units of government need to look at the level of all services that are provided, including Emergency Services, and decide what it can afford to finance going forward. Emergency Service costs can range from 25% to 50% of a local units budget. Artificially, placing restraints on Emergency Service costs puts unfair pressure on the local government to reduce costs of other functions and programs, namely Human Services, Public Works and Conservation and Development, in order to balance the annual budget.
- The current law uses the 2009 Emergency Service cost as the base year for every unit of government. What is the logic to use this year for everybody? The truth of matter is that some may have spent too much in 2009, some too little, and some just right. Correspondingly, some levels of Emergency Services expenditures of local government may not be in synch with the citizens' requests. Again some too much, some too little and some just right. In my opinion, setting a predetermined level for all governments through enactment of a state statute does not



make any sense. The level of service must be decided by the local governing body, with input from its constituents.

- With the recent changes put in place by the Budget Repair Bill, additional employee deductions will apply to all non-union Emergency Services personnel of local governments. The deductions will reduce the net local government cost of the services. Under the current law, the governments will have to potentially increase other costs of Emergency Services to meet the 2009 base level. Is this really the intent of the law?
- The current law is very difficult to effectively and fairly implement. The Department of Revenue has provided 24 questions and answers to typical questions from governments. There is a process to explain "no loss in service" and, also, to provide for appeals if reasons are denied by the Department of Revenue. I believe it is very difficult to objectively evaluate "one-time" expenditure adjustments and also, to objectively assess the level of service through reported expenditures and a supporting narrative. All of these interpretations make the current law difficult to enforce in a fair and equitable manner.

Examples of Three Municipalities

The following narrative describes three municipalities who have difficulties in complying with the current law:

- A small City in northern Wisconsin with a history of a full-time (24 hour) police force had to make some expenditure reductions due to local economic conditions and the need to reduce local property taxes. The full-time police force was, in part, maintained because of a large industrial complex located in the City. Most communities of their size in Wisconsin do not maintain 24 hour police protection. In recent years the major industry closed the local plant resulting in lower valuation for property tax purposes and the need for less police coverage. In other words, less police coverage or services were necessary and, in addition, the lower tax base required expenditure cuts to balance the annual budget. Under the current law ss. 79.07, it will be difficult for the City to do what is needed in regard to Emergency Services without incurring a penalty.
- A Village in central Wisconsin with a small police force of two full-time officers gained some operating efficiencies due to a retirement of a long-standing employee. The full-time officer was not replaced with another full-time officer, but the necessary hours were covered by additional part-time officers at a substantially lower cost. We are informed by Village personnel that police service has not been compromised. Because lower costs are being incurred, the current law requires the Village to justify to the Department of Revenue that the level of police service has not decreased in order to avoid a penalty.
- A Town in central Wisconsin contracts with a separate not-for-profit, volunteer fire department to provide fire protection. The fire department contracts with three other adjacent towns. Four quarterly payments are normally made by each Town to fire department each year. In 2010, the fire department decided it had accumulated sufficient funds during the first three quarters and did not need to collect the 4th quarter payment. As a result, the Town expenditures were less for the year 2010 compared to 2009. Although this scenario is a bit unusual, many rural fire department's annual expenditures for fire protection service vary considerably each year due to the differences in the number of fire calls. Again, under the current law, Towns will be required to assert that even with the lower level expenditures the service level has not decreased.

Summary

Based on the above reasons and examples, I am fully in support of AB 14 to repeal ss. 79.07. The passage of AB 14 is necessary for local units of government to effectively balance their annual budgets and set forth long-range financial plans to stabilize their future.

**Testimony from
City of Milwaukee:
Assembly Bill 14**

**Assembly Committee on
Urban & Local Affairs
April 26, 2011**

City of Milwaukee Position

1. Common Council supports AB 14: Repeal “maintenance of effort” (MOE) requirement for emergency services
2. City provides substantial budget support for Police & Fire Department services
3. Decline in State aid affects fiscal capacity
4. Levy limits & MOE are at odds
5. Taxpayers want performance & accountability

Emergency Services are the Budget Priority in Milwaukee

1. 2011 Police & Fire Department total budgets = \$332.34 million
 - 2011 Shared Revenue & ERP Aid = \$256.2 million
 - Budget commitment is 30% > State aid total
2. Police & Fire Department wages are 67.2% of total operating wages
 - 78% of wages funded by State aids/property taxes
3. Police & Fire Department sworn employees: ~ 43% of City total but ~ 66% of pension & OPEB liability

MOE Is Not Operationally Practical

1. Based on Governor's Budget, Shared Revenue & ERP will decline \$24 million since 2003 (\$10.3 million < for 2012)
2. Structural imbalance dates to prior decade
3. Proposed 2012 levy limit for Milwaukee => \$1.7 million
 - Police & Fire 2012 "baseline" cost increase: ~ \$15 million
4. State legislation: no controls on Police & Fire fringe benefits or collective bargaining changes

Performance Counts, Not \$\$ Thrown at a Problem

1. Despite Budget changes:
 - Crime is decreasing (25% < violent crime since 2008) & clearance rates are increasing
 - Fire suppression & emergency medical service response times remain superior to national benchmarks
2. Examples of productivity improvements:
 - Fire suppression & EMS capacity & benchmark staffing
 - Data-driven, real time police deployment
 - Increased use of lower-cost civilian staff
 - Differential police response for lower priority Police calls for service
 - Overtime & special duty pay controls
 - Technology applications
 - Return to work programs reduce time on injury leave
3. Improvement in community relations is a “force multiplier”
4. Smoke detector installation program as a fire prevention tool

Other Issues

1. Fire & Police Commission responsibility for efficiency & effectiveness
2. Treatment of fringe benefit savings & attrition-related salary savings
3. Pension funding
4. Importance of other local services to Milwaukee's sustainability

Questions & Comments

- For further information, contact:

Mark Nicolini

Budget & Management Director

City of Milwaukee

414-286-5060

mnicol@milwaukee.gov



22 EAST MIFFLIN STREET, SUITE 900
MADISON, WI 53703
TOLL FREE: 1.866.404.2700
PHONE: 608.663.7188
FAX: 608.663.7189
www.wicounties.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Members of the Assembly Committee on Urban and Local Affairs

FROM: David Callender, Legislative Associate *DC*

DATE: April 26, 2011

SUBJECT: Support for Assembly Bill 14

The Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA) supports Assembly Bill 14 (AB 14), which repeals the maintenance of effort requirements for emergency services spending enacted as part of 2009 Act 28, the 2009-11 state budget.

WCA believes that while emergency services are among the most vital services counties provide to their residents, any decision over how county resources are allocated among county programs should be made by elected county officials and not dictated by state-imposed requirements.

The decision on how to allocate financial resources, determining priorities among competing needs, is one of the greatest responsibilities county board members must exercise. Each county has different needs, but the maintenance of effort requirement undermines the decision-making process by requiring all counties to maintain funding for emergency services at or above 2009 levels.

At a time when state funding is being reduced and counties are forced to operate under state-imposed levy limits, exempting one category of county services from potential reductions increases budgetary pressure on other services, such as child protection, aid to the elderly and disabled, and programs that help residents whose lives have been disrupted by the current economic downturn.

Moreover, the reporting requirements that accompany the maintenance of effort are burdensome to counties, requiring county administrators and finance directors to fill out unnecessary paperwork to report their compliance with the law.

Finally, the actual requirements of Wis. Stats. 79.07 remain in dispute. The Department of Revenue has taken the position that **all emergency service expenditures, regardless of the source of their funding**, are subject to the maintenance of effort requirement, and not simply those services funded from shared revenues. This interpretation is contrary to the intent of the co-chairs of the Joint Committee on Finance who prepared the amendment and the interpretations of both the Legislative Reference Bureau and the Legislative Fiscal Bureau.

The law provides that:

*Except as provided in sub. (3), beginning in 2010, the amount that each county and municipality spends each year for emergency services, as defined by the department of revenue **to include only emergency services funded from payments received under ss. 79.035 and 79.043**, shall be no less than the amount that the county or municipality spent in 2009 for emergency services.*

However, the Department in its worksheets asks municipalities to determine as a baseline the total amounts spent on emergency services in 2008 and 2009. The Department's worksheet states that the baseline amounts should include both the budgeted amounts and actual expenditures for 2008 and 2009 from **all funds**, less one-time expenses and capital expenditures.

The statute is clear on its face. The calculation for 2009 base level funding for emergency services should include only those emergency services funded from shared revenue under Sec. 79.035 and 79.043, which are the statutes governing county and municipal aid and municipal aid, respectively. This is supported by the fact that the penalty for funding emergency services below the 2009 base level is a reduction in shared revenue under Sec. 79.035 and 79.043.

The Department's interpretation of emergency services as including expenditures from all funds, not only from shared revenues, also does not reflect the legislative history of this provision.

The Legislative Fiscal Bureau, in its August 2009 Comparative Summary of Budget Recommendations, outlined the evolution of Sec. 79.07. The Joint Finance Committee adopted an amendment that specified the baseline amount would be "**the amount that each county and municipality spends for emergency services**" without specifying the funding source.

However, the Senate amended that provision. According to the Fiscal Bureau summary, the Senate amendment specified that "the definition of emergency services under this provision includes **only those emergency service expenditures that are funded with payments under**

the county and municipal aid program.” The Senate language was adopted by the Conference Committee and the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

This distinction was clear to the parties who negotiated these provisions. In discussions related to the maintenance of effort, the parties agreed that the baseline would apply only to the percentage of emergency services derived from shared revenue in a given municipality's budget. For example, if shared revenue makes up 5 percent of a municipality's budget, and that municipality's police department's budget is \$100,000, then the portion of the police department's budget subject to the maintenance of effort requirement would be \$5,000. Under the Department's interpretation, the entire \$100,000 is subject to the maintenance of effort.

The legislative intent of the amendment was not to monitor all expenditures, but to monitor only those expenditures funded from shared revenues. If the Legislature had intended for the maintenance of effort to apply to all funds, it would have adopted the Joint Finance language instead of the Senate amendment. And if the Governor had intended for the Joint Finance language to remain, he would have vetoed the Senate language adopted by the Legislature.

The Department of Revenue has in its public comments at various times indicated that it will “work with” local governments in interpreting the maintenance of effort requirements as broadly as possible, but this approach does not address the fundamental shortcomings of the legislation and the department's misinterpretation of the statutory language. **The simplest way to address these shortcomings is to repeal the maintenance of effort language.**

WCA respectfully requests that the committee approve Assembly Bill 14.

THE WISCONSIN PROFESSIONAL POLICE ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Assembly Committee on Urban and Local Affairs

FROM: Jim Palmer, Executive Director

DATE: March 26, 2011

RE: Opposition to 2011 Assembly Bill 14

With nearly 11,000 members, the Wisconsin Professional Police Association (WPPA) is the state's largest law enforcement organization. Our mission is to protect and promote public safety, as well as the interests of the dedicated men and women who serve to provide it. The WPPA genuinely appreciates this opportunity to offer our strenuous opposition to 2011 Assembly Bill 14, which repeals certain spending requirements for local emergency services.

During the formulation of the last state budget, Governor Doyle and the legislature faced the prospect of implementing a significant cut in the aid the state provides to Wisconsin's local governments. To avoid an aid reduction of nearly ten percent, which would have been calamitous for all local services, they created the "Police and Fire Protection Fee" on telephone use. The revenue from this fee, approximately \$100 million over a biennium, is used to support local governments, and ended up reducing the cut in state aid in the last budget to less than three percent.

The state budget also included a provision to insulate police and fire services. In short, a local government can be penalized with a reduction in state aid if it reduces its public safety spending below a certain level. Still, the law includes a great deal of flexibility in allowing local governments to obtain an exemption if they can show that their proposed cuts will make them more efficient without reducing services. To date, the WPPA is not aware of a single local government that has been penalized for implementing efficiencies. This is true even in the case of the City of Pewaukee, which abolished its police department to contract for law enforcement services with Waukesha County at the end of 2009. One could reasonably conclude that there is no problem for the legislature to address here.

Given that local budgetary woes across the state would have been far worse had it not been for the Police and Fire Protection Fee, it is only appropriate that the services for which that fee is generated receive some minimal degree of protection. It is good public policy that this special consideration be sustained,

and Governor Walker deserves credit for not proposing the elimination of this protection in either of his recent budget bills.

This is especially true when one considers the experience of the law enforcement community here in Wisconsin. For instance, from 2005 to 2009, the last year for which data is available, the number of assaults on law enforcement officers in this state increased by an astonishing 180%. Additionally, the WPPA represented members involved in 31 different officer-involved shootings in 2010, an unfortunate record high that easily surpassed our previous high mark of 7 such shootings in 2006. It is our conclusion that while the crime rates in Wisconsin have decreased, criminal suspects have become increasingly more aggressive in their interactions with law enforcement officers. Now is the time to consider additional investments in the state's law enforcement efforts, and not to explore ways to allow local governments to make additional cuts that will affect not only public safety, but officer safety as well. In the event Governor Walker's proposed spending cuts to electronic citations and assistant district attorney staffing levels come to fruition, this situation will only worsen, and local governments are sure to find themselves even more strained to meet the demands that our safety requires.

Under Assembly Bill 14, telephone bills will continue to reflect the imposition of the Police and Fire Protection Fee, but in reality, Wisconsin's law enforcement officers and fire fighters will not receive any special consideration. The current law helps to prioritize public safety services while still allowing local governments the flexibility to make their ends meet. In stripping police and fire of these protections while maintaining a phone charge that conveys to the public that it is meant to support public safety, Assembly Bill 14 deceptively fails to meet the ideals of transparency by any objective measure.

Given the foregoing, the WPPA respectfully requests that the members of this committee vote against this legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Council Manager Government Since 1924



Office of the City Manager
1717 East Park Street
Post Office Box 87
Two Rivers WI 54241-0087
Telephone 920/793-5532
FAX 920/793-5563

April 25, 2011

Representative Edward Brooks
Chairman
Committee on Urban and Local Affairs
Wisconsin State Assembly
State Capitol
Madison, WI 53708

RE: Testimony in Support of Assembly Bill 14, Repealing "Maintenance of Effort" Requirement for County and Municipal Spending on Emergency Services

Dear Chairman Brooks and Committee Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to present written testimony in support of Assembly Bill 14. The City of Two Rivers is pleased that this legislation, authored by our neighbor, Representative Bob Ziegelbauer of Manitowoc, and sponsored by our Assemblyman, Representative Andre Jacque, is being considered at your hearing on April 26, 2011.

The City of Two Rivers strongly supports adoption of Assembly Bill 14, which would repeal the "Maintenance of Effort" mandate for spending on emergency by county and municipal governments across Wisconsin.

There are several reasons to repeal and rescind this "**mandate to spend**," which was inserted into the FY 2010-11 State Budget with no opportunity for public debate, as part of a deal to substitute phone tax revenues for General Purpose Revenues in funding Shared Revenues. Those reasons include:

1. **Local Control.** Local elected officials should determine the appropriate spending levels for various local services. If our City Council determines that, in the overall scheme of things, it wishes to spend less money on protective services, it should not incur a penalty in the form of a reduction in its Shared Revenues payment in the ensuing year(s), as is the case under the "Maintenance of Effort" mandate.

2. **Fiscal Reality.** Budgets are very tight at the local level, and will only get tighter with looming cuts in Shared Revenues and stringent levy caps as proposed in Governor Walker's 2012-13 State Budget. In times like these, it is entirely inappropriate for the State to put local spending for Police, Fire and Ambulance services—which constitute over 50 percent of most local operating budgets—"off limits" for budget cuts.
3. **Making Good Use of Department of Revenue Staff Resources.** With all of our State's budget problems, aren't there better things for DOR staff to be doing than monitoring local spending to assure that that counties and municipalities spend enough on Police, Fire and Ambulance services, or trying to figure out whether local spending cuts in these areas qualify as "efficiencies" instead of "reduced effort?" Whatever amount is being spent in administering and enforcing this mandate, it's too much.


Our City's position in support of repealing "Maintenance of Effort" for emergency services spending has been stated in a formal resolution by the Two Rivers City Council, and is consistent with the position of the Wisconsin League of Municipalities and many individual local governments across Wisconsin.

Those of us involved in local government have been concerned about this mandate since it first appeared (much to our surprise) in the current State Budget, and have made our concerns known. Most members of the general public, when informed that such a law even exists, shake their heads in disbelief.

The "Maintenance of Effort" requirement deserves to be removed from Wisconsin law, and relegated to the history books as an example of legislative log-rolling at its worst.

We urge your committee to recommend passage of AB 14 to the full Assembly.

Sincerely,


Gregory E. Buckley
City Manager

CC: Representative Bob Ziegelbauer
Representative Andre Jacque
City Council

Kostelic, Luanne

From: Village of Thiensville - Dianne Robertson [drobertson@village.thiensville.wi.us]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 10:52 AM
To: Rep.Brooks; Rep.Thiesfeldt; Rep.Spanbauer; Rep.Jacque; Rep.Knudson; Ziegelbauer, Bob;
Rep.Ringhand; Rep.Coggs; Rep.Pocan
Subject: [Possible SPAM] AB14
Importance: Low

The Village of Thiensville is in support of AB14, repealing county and municipal expenditures for emergency services. Municipalities are in need of these tools in which to deal the with loss of state aid and levy limits.

Regards,
Dianne Robertson
Thiensville Village Administrator

4/25/2011

Kostelic, Luanne

From: Stacy Grunwald [sgrunwald@clevelandwi.gov]

Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 9:50 AM

To: Ziegelbauer, Bob

Subject: Please Support AB14

Dear Rep. Ziegelbauer:

Please support AB14, the bill to repeal the requirement that municipalities maintain expenditures on police and fire fighting services at 2009 levels. This elimination of flexibility in our local budgets and staffing levels is unnecessary and places additional burden on our time and finances. Last year, at least two hours of staff time was needed to prepare the report and the supplemental information explaining why our expenditures were below prior-year levels. Now the report and attachment sit in Madison, taking up space. And to what benefit?

My Board is committed to protecting public safety and should be allowed latitude when deciding how these services should be funded.

Thank you for your time!

Stacy Grunwald
Village of Cleveland
920-693-8181
sgrunwald@clevelandwi.gov

4/25/2011

Kostelic, Luanne

From: Todd J. Schmidt [tschmidt@vil.waunakee.wi.us]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Rep.Brooks; Rep.Thiesfeldt
Cc: Rep.Spanbauer; Rep.Jacque; Rep.Knudson; Ziegelbauer, Bob; Rep.Ringhand; Rep.Coggs; Rep.Pocan
Subject: [Possible SPAM] AB 14
Importance: Low

Honorable Representative Brooks and Thiesfeldt:

I am writing regarding Assembly Bill 14, which would eliminate the current "maintenance of effort" provisions for public safety. I would like to express my support for this legislation and strongly encourage you and your committee to vote for its passage. As a practical matter, the current law simply does not make sense. Essentially, it prohibits local units of government from improving the efficiency of their operations in the areas that are their biggest cost centers – police and fire departments.

In this economic environment it is extremely important to continue to look for additional efficiencies throughout all our departments, including public safety. We continue to look for those here in Waunakee, and I am sure many other communities are doing the same. Thank you for your effort on this bill. I look forward to its passage by your committee, the full Assembly and the State Senate.

Sincerely,

Todd J. Schmidt
Village Administrator / Economic Development Director
Village of Waunakee
500 W. Main St.
Waunakee, WI 53597
Village Hall Phone: (608)850-8500
Direct Line: (608)850-5227
Cell: (608)219-0341
E-Mail: tschmidt@vil.waunakee.wi.us
Web: www.vil.waunakee.wi.us
Blog: www.waunablog.blogspot.com

4/26/2011

